

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-35 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20-32, 34 and 35 have been amended. Claims 1 and 20 are independent.

Allowable Subject Matter

Initially, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication in the Office Action that claims 18, 19, 34 and 35 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the features of their base claims and any intervening claims.

Objections to the Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification for various informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments to the specification and claims have addressed each informality indicated by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 12, 20, 21, 24, 25 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,966,021 to

Eliashberg et al. (hereinafter "Eliashberg"). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

As amended, independent claims 1 and 20 both recite a plurality of test equipments, each generating a test signal for a corresponding one of a plurality of logical groups of modules in an environmental stress screening room. Applicants respectfully submit that Eliashberg fails to disclose this feature.

Eliashberg discloses a testing system including multiple burn-in boards, each of which contain a plurality of memory chips. Eliashberg teaches that one computer controls the burn-in tests of the memory chips for each burn-in board in the oven. Accordingly, as noted by the Examiner in the Office Action (see the paragraph linking pages 2 and 3), the computer operates as a single test equipment that generates the test signal and receives the test results for all of the burn-in boards during testing.

Accordingly, Eliashberg fails to disclose a plurality of test equipments, each of which generates a test signal for a corresponding group of modules during testing, as required by independent claims 1 and 20. Instead, Eliashberg only discloses one test equipment for generating one test signal, which is commonly sent to the memory chips on each of the burn-in boards.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 20 are allowable. Furthermore, Applicants submit

that claims 2, 6, 7, 10, 12, 21, 24, 25 and 29 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 20.

Claims 3, 13, 22 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eliashberg in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,870,407 to Hsia et al. (hereinafter “Hsia”). Applicants respectfully submit that Hsia fails to remedy the deficiencies of Eliashberg set forth above in connection with claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 3, 13, 22 and 30 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 20.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eliashberg in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,175,812 to Boyington et al. (hereinafter “Boyington”). Applicants respectfully submit that Boyington fails to remedy the deficiencies of Eliashberg listed above in connection with claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

Claims 5 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eliashberg in view of Hsia and Boyington. As mentioned above, it is respectfully submitted that neither Hsia nor Boyington remedies the deficiencies of Eliashberg with respect to independent claims 1 and 20. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 5 and 23 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 20.

Claims 8 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eliashberg in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,119,255 to Akram (hereinafter “Akram”). Applicants respectfully submit that Akram fails to remedy the deficiencies of Eliashberg discussed above in connection with independent claims 1 and 20. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 8 and 26 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 20.

Claims 9 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eliashberg in view of Akram, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,137,830 to Schneider et al. (hereinafter “Schneider”). Applicants submit that neither Akram nor Schneider remedies the deficiencies of Eliashberg set forth above in connection with independent claims 1 and 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9 and 27 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 20.

Claims 11 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eliashberg in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,907,514 to Lee et al. (hereinafter “Lee”). Applicants submit that Lee fails to remedy the deficiencies of Eliashberg with respect to independent claims 1 and 20 as set forth above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11 and 28 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 20.

Claims 14-17 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eliashberg in view of U. S. Patent No. 4,866,714 to

Adams (hereinafter "Adams"). Applicants respectfully submit that Adams fails to remedy the deficiencies of Eliashberg indicated above in connection with independent claims 1 and 20. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 14-17 and 31-33 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 20.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the various claim rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in connection with the present application.

Should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at the telephone number of the undersigned to discuss this application.

Application No.: 09/975,722
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2003
Atty. Docket: 4450-0123P
Art Unit: 2857

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By:


Michael R. Cammarata
Reg. No. 39,491

JR
MRC/JWR/slb

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000